

NCATE and TEAC Responses to California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Questions

Professional Services Division

June 15, 2006

The Commission assigned the COA and Accreditation Workgroup to address Topic 18 Standards. Two national accrediting bodies, NCATE and TEAC were sent questionnaires reflecting how their accreditation review practices relate to those used by the COA. Following are the responses to these questions:

NCATE Responses to California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Questions

- 1. What programs can be reviewed through your program review processes (see list of current California programs below)? What would the program review process look like? When would it occur?**

The NCATE accreditation process has two primary components: the unit review and the program review. The unit is the school, college or department of education—the entity with the responsibility for managing or coordinating all programs offered for the initial and continuing preparation of teachers and other school personnel, regardless of where these programs are administratively housed. The unit is reviewed by an NCATE Board of Examiners team that completes a site visit and evaluates the unit against the six NCATE unit standards.

A program is a discipline-specific component within a unit that provides a planned sequence of courses and experiences for preparing P–12 teachers and other professional school personnel (e.g. social studies educators, school psychologists). These courses and experiences often lead to a recommendation for a state license to work in schools.

Program reviews are submitted on-line, using a form available on the NCATE web site. The standards for programs are developed by the appropriate specialized professional associations (SPAs). Program reviewers evaluate the program report to determine if the program meets the appropriate SPA standards. Because NCATE Unit Standard One requires that the unit demonstrate that its candidates “know the content of their fields, demonstrate professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions and apply them so that students learn” this information becomes very important at the unit level.

NCATE’s system for program reviews requires submission of 6-8 assessments which provide evidence of candidate mastery of specialized professional associations (SPA) standards. The program review system is centrally managed by NCATE staff, although the review of programs is conducted by the SPAs’ content specialists. The program report format is common across SPAs. All SPAs require aggregated data and analysis of assessments in five areas:

- State licensure examinations of content knowledge;
- At least one additional assessment of content knowledge;

- An assessment of candidate ability to plan instruction, or (for non-teaching fields) to fulfill identified professional responsibilities;
- The evaluation of clinical practice; and,
- An assessment that demonstrates candidate effect on student learning or (for non-teaching fields) the ability to create supportive learning environments.

Institutions (including institutions in the candidacy stage) are expected to submit program reports one semester before the scheduled NCATE visit. Specific SPA standards and report templates may be found on the NCATE website

<<http://www.ncate.org/programreview/programStandards.asp?>>

(See Attachment “A” for “California Educator Programs for which NCATE has Standards.”)

2. **How would your accreditation process address California specific issues/adopted K-12 student content standards, teaching English learners, and addressing diversity -- in both the program and institution reviews?**

NCATE Unit Standard One requires candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards. Therefore, NCATE is willing to assess California teacher education and student standards at the institutional/provider (unit) level as well as at the program level. An analysis of NCATE’s program standards revealed that each content area requires assessments that demonstrate candidate effects on student learning. (Attachment “B”) NCATE program reviewers would be instructed to assess the degree to which programs address California student standards in reviews of California teacher education programs.

NCATE Unit Standard Four requires that the unit design, implement, and evaluate curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students in P–12 schools. Specifically, the rubrics used to assess the degree to which the provider meets NCATE’s Diversity Standard at the “acceptable” and “target” include such requirements as:

Acceptable: The unit clearly articulates the proficiencies that candidates are expected to develop during their professional program. Curriculum and accompanying field experiences are designed to help candidates understand the importance of diversity in teaching and learning. Candidates learn to develop and teach lessons that incorporate diversity and develop a classroom and school climate that values diversity. Candidates become aware of different teaching and learning styles shaped by cultural influences and are able to adapt instruction and services appropriately for all students, including students with exceptionalities. They demonstrate dispositions that value fairness and learning by all students. Assessments of candidate proficiencies provide data on the ability to help all students learn. Candidates’ assessment data are used to provide feedback to candidates for improving their knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Target: Curriculum, field experiences, and clinical practice help candidates to demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to diversity. They are based on well-developed knowledge bases for, and conceptualizations of, diversity and inclusion so that candidates can apply them effectively in schools. Candidates learn to contextualize teaching and to draw upon representations from the students’ own experiences and knowledge. They learn how to challenge students toward cognitive complexity and engage all students, including students with exceptionalities, through instructional conversation. Candidates and faculty review assessment data that provide information about candidates’ ability to work with all students and develop a plan for improving their practice in this area.

Acceptable: Candidates interact and work with candidates from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups in professional education courses on campus and in schools. Candidates from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups work together on committees and education projects related to education and the content areas. The affirmation of the values of diversity is shown through good-faith efforts made to increase or maintain candidate diversity.

Target: Candidates interact and work with candidates with exceptionalities and from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, language, socioeconomic, and religious groups in professional education courses on campus and in schools. The active participation of candidates from diverse cultural backgrounds and with different experiences is solicited, and valued and accepted in classes, field experiences, and clinical practice.

Acceptable: Field experiences or clinical practice in settings with exceptional populations and students from different ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups are designed for candidates to develop and practice their knowledge, skills, and dispositions for working with all students. Feedback from peers and supervisors helps candidates reflect on their ability to help all students learn.

Target: Extensive and substantive field experiences and clinical practices are designed to encourage candidates to interact with exceptional students and students from different ethnic, racial, gender, socioeconomic, language, and religious groups. The experiences help candidates confront issues of diversity that affect teaching and student learning and develop strategies for improving student learning and candidates' effectiveness as teachers

NCATE's latest revision of its unit standard on diversity specifically emphasizes the English learner. Revised Unit Standard Four states: The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and *provides* experiences for candidates to acquire and *demonstrate* the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. *Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity.* Experiences *provided for candidates* include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P-12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P-12 schools.

UNACCEPTABLE: *The unit has not articulated candidate proficiencies related to diversity. The curriculum and field experiences for the preparation of educators do not prepare candidates to work effectively with diverse populations, including English language learners and students with exceptionalities. Candidates do not understand the importance of diversity in teaching and learning. They are not developing skills for incorporating diversity into their teaching and are not able to establish a classroom and school climate that values diversity. Assessments of candidate proficiencies do not include data on candidates' ability to incorporate multiple perspectives into their teaching or service, develop lessons or services for students with different learning styles, accommodate linguistically and culturally diverse students and students with exceptionalities, and communicate effectively with diverse populations.*

ACCEPTABLE: The unit clearly articulates proficiencies related to diversity that candidates are expected to develop during their professional programs. Curriculum and field experiences provide a well-grounded framework for understanding diversity, including English language learners and students with exceptionalities. *Candidates are aware of different learning styles and adapt instruction or services appropriately for all students, including linguistically and culturally diverse students and students with exceptionalities. Candidates connect lessons, instruction, or services to students' experiences and cultures. They communicate with students and families in ways that demonstrate sensitivity to cultural and gender differences. Candidates incorporate multiple perspectives in the subject matter being taught or services being provided. They develop a classroom and school climate that values diversity. Candidates demonstrate classroom behaviors that are consistent with the ideas of fairness and the belief that all students can learn. Candidate proficiencies related to diversity are assessed and the data are used to provide feedback to candidates for improving their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping students from diverse populations learn.*

3. **Would you be willing to use California specific teacher preparation program standards rather than your own national standards? Do you do this in any other state currently? How would this work?**

NCATE would be willing to apply "California specific" teacher preparation program standards that are not included in NCATE's specialized professional association standards. (See response to question one.) Often state laws or policies specify teacher education and student standards or define state licensure requirements in such a manner that NCATE must adjust its review of certain programs. The *State/NCATE Protocol* specifies any unique review requirements as well as defines the roles and responsibilities of NCATE, the state and the institution. Furthermore, because NCATE administers the program review process, it is possible to train and manage reviewers to evaluate programs offered by California teacher education providers according to California standards.

4. If California accepted national accreditation in lieu of state accreditation for those institutions that voluntarily seek national accreditation, how might that work with your system?

California's decision to accept national accreditation in lieu of state accreditation would have no effect on the NCATE accreditation system. NCATE would conduct its accreditation process according to the policies and guidelines posted on the NCATE website. NCATE would provide California with its accreditation decisions, reports and findings. California officials would determine how to utilize NCATE information for purposes of authorizing a teacher education provider to operate in the state.

5. If California mandated national accreditation for all institutions, what role would the state play with respect to the accreditation decisions of California's institutions?

NCATE accreditation decisions and state accreditation decisions are separately conducted. The state may determine whether – or to what degree – it considers NCATE accreditation status in the state accreditation decision of California teacher education providers.

6. How would your process operate if there is no program approval process or reviews done by California?

If California does not conduct the program approval review, NCATE would administer and conduct the program reviews using NCATE trained SPA reviewers and the NCATE program review system for purposes of NCATE accreditation – at no cost to the state.

7. Does your accreditation system examine alternative certification programs that are administered by a higher education institution or by a local K-12 agency? How does this process work?

NCATE policy includes **all** alternative certification programs, alternative certification programs administered by a higher education institution, by a local K-12 agency or any other provider of teacher education. All providers are held to the same NCATE standards and process.

8. California's educator preparation enterprise encompasses 90+ institutions, ranging in size from under 25 to over 1,000 candidates per year. How is accreditation within your system paid for, and what might be the cost structure for institutions in California

NCATE's operating budget is based on dues from its 33 member organizations, institutional/provider fees and foundation funding. Institutional/provider fees are based on enrollment. Institutions accredited by NCATE, including Pre-Candidate and Candidate Institutions, are required to pay an annual Accreditation Fee according to the following schedule based on graduates for FY 2007:

FY 2007 Institutional Accreditation Fees	
1-50	\$1,930
51-150	\$2,145
151-300	\$2,440
301-500	\$2,805
501-1,000	\$3,695
Over 1000	\$4,300

Institutions pay a *Periodic Evaluation Fee* of \$1,000 per BOE team member to conduct the on site accreditation visit. The number of BOE team members assigned to an institution is usually three to eight persons, and is determined by the NCATE Accreditation Department based on factors including number and size of the institution's programs, and the state partnership agreement, following the guidelines outlined in the *Handbook for Accreditation Visits*.

9. What is the link in your system between program outcomes and student achievement? Do you see a link? If so, how do you measure the relationship?

As noted, NCATE's unit and program standards place emphasis on the relationship between teacher candidates and student learning. Units as a whole – and individual programs – must present aggregated data on the impact of teacher candidates on student learning. Some units and programs use "teacher work sample methodology" to generate this data but NCATE allows units and programs to design their own assessments, including their assessment of candidate impact on student learning. These measures are typically derived during clinical or student teaching experiences. California institutions place their candidates in California schools. Consequently, candidates must know the California student standards, plan lessons consistent with them, and assess students before and after instruction. Thus, NCATE requirements provide incentives for candidates to learn about California student standards as well as measures of their success in having done so. See Attachment B for a detailed listing of unit and program requirements for student learning.

10. What are the levels of accreditation that your system offers?

Accreditation Decisions After the First Visit:

Accreditation. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit meets each of the six NCATE standards for unit accreditation. Areas for improvement may be cited, indicating problems warranting the institution's attention. In its subsequent annual reports, the unit may describe progress made in addressing the areas for improvement cited in NCATE's action report. The next on-site visit is scheduled for five years following the semester of the accreditation visit. First accreditation is retroactive to the semester or quarter in which the on-site visit occurred

Provisional Accreditation. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit has not met one or more of the standards. When the Unit Accreditation Board (UAB) renders this decision, the unit has accredited status, but must satisfy provisions by meeting previously unmet standard(s).

If provisional accreditation is granted, the UAB will require (1) submission of documentation that addresses the unmet standard(s) within six months of the accreditation decision or (2) a focused visit on the unmet standard(s) within two years* of the semester that the provisional accreditation decision was granted. When a decision is made by the UAB to require submission of documentation, the institution may choose to waive that option in favor of a focused visit within two years* of the semester that the provisional accreditation decision was made.

If documentation is submitted under the terms specified in the above paragraph, the UAB will decide to (1) grant accreditation or (2) require a focused visit within one year of the semester in which the documentation was submitted. If a focused visit occurs, within the timeframes as specified above, the UAB will decide to (1) grant accreditation or (2) revoke accreditation.

If accreditation is granted, the next on-site visit is scheduled for five years following the semester in which the first accreditation visit occurred.

In cases where the UAB grants provisional accreditation solely because of concerns with test scores, the UAB will require submission of documentation that addresses the unmet standard within two years* of the semester that the provisional accreditation decision was granted. If documentation is submitted under these terms, the UAB will decide to (1) continue accreditation or (2) revoke accreditation. If accreditation is continued, the next on-site visit is scheduled for five years following the semester in which the accreditation visit occurred.

Denial of Accreditation. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit does not meet one or more of the NCATE standards, and has pervasive problems that limit its capacity to offer quality programs that adequately prepare candidates.

Revocation of Accreditation. Following a focused visit that occurs as a result of a provisional accreditation decision, this accreditation decision indicates that the unit has not sufficiently addressed the unmet standard(s).

Continuing Accreditation Decisions:

Continuing Accreditation: This accreditation decision indicates that the unit meets each of the six NCATE standards for unit accreditation. Areas for improvement may be cited, indicating problems warranting the institution's attention. In its subsequent annual reports, the unit is encouraged to describe progress made in addressing the areas for improvement cited in NCATE's action report. The next on-site visit is scheduled for five or seven years following the semester of the continuing accreditation visit, depending on the state in which the institution is located.

When one level of the unit receives continuing accreditation and a new level is accredited for the first time, the next accreditation visit will be in seven years if the state agency has agreed to a seven-year cycle of reviews.

Accreditation with Conditions: This accreditation decision indicates that the unit has not met one or more of the NCATE standards. When the UAB renders this decision, the unit maintains its accredited status but must satisfy conditions by meeting the previously unmet standard(s).

If accreditation with conditions is granted, the UAB will require (1) submission of documentation that addresses the unmet standard(s) within six months of the accreditation decision or (2) a focused visit on the unmet standard(s) within two years* of the semester that the accreditation with conditions was granted. When a decision is made by the UAB to require submission of documentation, the institution may choose to waive that option in favor of a focused visit within two years* of the semester that the accreditation with conditions decision was made.

If documentation is submitted under the terms specified in the above paragraph, the UAB will decide to (1) continue accreditation or (2) require a focused visit within one year of the semester in which the documentation was submitted. If a focused visit occurs, within the timeframes as specified above, the UAB will decide to (1) continue accreditation or (2) revoke accreditation.

If continuing accreditation is granted, the next on-site visit is scheduled for seven years (in some states, five years) following the semester in which the continuing accreditation visit occurred. This scheduling maintains the unit's original accreditation cycle.

In cases where the UAB grants accreditation with conditions solely because of concerns with test scores, the UAB will require submission of documentation that addresses the unmet standard within two years* of the semester that the accreditation with conditions decision was granted. If documentation is submitted under these terms, the UAB will decide to (1) continue accreditation or (2) revoke accreditation. If continuing accreditation is granted, the next on-site visit is scheduled for seven years (in some states, five years) following the semester in which the accreditation visit occurred.

Accreditation with Probation: This accreditation decision indicates that the unit does not meet one or more of the NCATE standards, and has pervasive problems that limit its capacity to offer quality programs that adequately prepare candidates.

If accreditation with probation is granted, the unit must schedule an on-site visit within two years of the semester in which the probationary decision was rendered. The unit as part of this visit must address all NCATE standards in effect at the time of the probationary review at the two-year point.

Following the on-site review, the UAB will decide to (1) continue accreditation or (2) revoke accreditation. If accreditation is continued, the next on-site visit is scheduled for five years after the semester of the probationary visit.

Revocation of Accreditation: [1] Following a comprehensive site visit that occurs as a result of a UAB decision to accredit with probation, this accreditation decision indicates that the unit does not meet one or more of the NCATE standards, and has pervasive problems that limit its capacity to offer quality programs that adequately prepare candidates.

Following a focused visit that occurs as a result of a UAB decision to accredit with conditions, this accreditation decision indicates that the unit has not sufficiently addressed the unmet standard(s).

11. When an institution is not accredited, is there an appeal process? If yes, how does the appeal process work?

Any institution, state, or association that is the object of an adverse decision, as made by one of NCATE's governance boards, may appeal that decision. An adverse decision as defined by NCATE's boards includes: the denial of an application for, or the revocation of, a state partnership; the denial or revocation of constituent membership; the denial of application for, or the revocation of, program recognition; and the denial or revocation of institutional accreditation.

An institution may also appeal, in writing, a probationary accreditation decision or a decision to grant provisional accreditation or accreditation with conditions.

An adverse decision and decisions to accredit with probation, with provisions, or with conditions may be appealed only on the grounds that:

NCATE standards were disregarded, stated procedures were not followed (for institutions), evidence favorable to the institution and provided to the Board of Examiners was not considered, or (for institutions) evidence favorable to the institution and provided to the UAB was not considered. If a college or university believes that one or more of these four conditions was a factor in the denial, revocation, or probation of its accreditation, or a factor in the decision to grant provisional or conditional accreditation, the only available means of redress is through the appeals process.

Although an institution may appeal an adverse, provisional, conditional, or probation decision in which there was a lack of a full number of team members due to last-minute emergencies, that factor alone is not sufficient to uphold an appeal. The institution must convincingly demonstrate that this fact made a difference in the accreditation decision. The institution would have to show two things: (1) actual prejudice to it; and (2) that the prejudice changed the accreditation decision. The fact that the institution did not recommend canceling the visit would be evidence that it, at least before the visit, believed that the assembled team would be sufficient to conduct a fair and complete visit.

An appeal is heard by a Review Panel, consisting of five members selected from the Appeals Board. Responsibility for acting on the findings and recommendations of the Review Panel rests with the governance board whose decision is being appealed. The findings of the Review Panel are communicated to the institution in a written report that conveys the basis of the action taken by the Panel. The findings and recommendations of the Review Panel are received by the Executive Board at its first meeting following the hearing. In the case of accreditation decisions remanded to the UAB by a Review Panel, subsequent action will be based on the grounds for appeal that were upheld by the Review Panel and can include, but are not limited to, (1) assigning another BOE team to revisit an institution or (2) reviewing the case again and rendering a second accreditation decision, which may be the same as or different from the original decision. The status of the appellant at the time of the visit remains unchanged until the appeals process has been exhausted.

Process of Appeal

The following provisions govern the appellate process:

Within 15 days of receiving notice of an appealable decision, an institution, state, or association electing to appeal that decision must present the president of NCATE written notification of its intention to appeal.

No later than 30 days from the date that it submits its notification, the institution, state, or association must submit a brief to the president of NCATE that sets forth the specifics of its appeal and includes full documentation.

The president of NCATE will appoint a Review Panel, drawn from the Appeals Board, to hear the appeal. One of the appointees will be designated as chair of the Review Panel.

No later than 30 days after submission of the appellant's brief, the Review Panel is convened to hear and act on the appeal. Prior to the hearing itself, the Panel is trained by NCATE staff on the process and procedures for hearing an appeal, including the decisions that must be made by the Panel.

The Panel prepares a written report that conveys the basis of its findings and action taken on the appeal, and submits that report to the institution within two days of action taken by the Panel. If the appeal is not upheld by the Review Panel, the decision of the Unit Accreditation Board becomes final at this point and is subject to disclosure and notification procedures as described in NCATE's Policies on Dissemination of Information.

If the decision is to deny or revoke accreditation, the appellant shall have the right to appear before the Review Panel to present a 30 minute oral argument on its brief. The appellant shall also have the right to representation by counsel during the appeal, but may not call witnesses or introduce new evidence on its own behalf.

If the decision appealed is provisional, conditional, or probationary accreditation, the appellant's right to appeal is limited to the submission of written documentation and the opportunity to make a teleconference presentation to the Review Panel during the half-hour period that precedes the panel's deliberations on its appeal. The chair of the BOE team and the chair of the appropriate Unit Accreditation Board audit committee also participate in the teleconference that precedes the panel's deliberations.

Whether the institution is presenting information in person or via teleconference, individuals designated as "institutional representatives" must be employees of the institution or must have been employed by the institution at the time of the site visit.

In the case of an accreditation decision review, all evidence presented in the appellant's brief and considered by the Review Panel must be confined to conditions existing at the time of the Board of Examiners team visit as cited in the action report from NCATE.

Costs of Review

If the appeal leads to an affirmation of NCATE's original decision, the appellant will be liable for a set fee (currently, \$4,000.00) to cover the expenses of the Review Panel. If the panel finds in favor of the institution, the fee will not be assessed.

Access to Documents

In cases of accreditation decision reviews, team chairs and audit committee chairs serving as witnesses to hearings of the NCATE Review Panel will be provided copies of pertinent action letters and reports. Appellant petitions of appeals are provided to all witnesses.

12. In case of a conditional accreditation, how does your system address subsequent reviews?

See response to Question 10.

13. How does your system insure that reviewers have the expertise appropriate for the institutions programs?

Program reviewers are selected, trained, assigned and evaluated by the SPA and NCATE.

Members of NCATE's Board of Examiners (BOE) are selected on the basis of demonstrated expertise in professional education, teaching, research, and/or evaluation. Individuals nominated to the BOE should have: demonstrated expertise in the field of professional education, teaching, research, and/or evaluation; skill in use of evaluation techniques, such as the interpretation of quantified data, use of rating scales and questionnaires, interviewing and observation techniques, and analysis of written information; skill in the use of computer technology, including accessing the Internet, using email, navigating websites, reviewing documents on-line, and word processing; good writing skills: the ability to convey clearly and concisely observations and judgments in writing; the ability to make unbiased professional judgments about education units based on the application of national standards; good interpersonal skills: the ability to interact with team members and institutional personnel in a courteous and collegial manner and the ability to work toward consensus in team deliberations; word processing skills and e-mail access.

As BOE visits are intensive and often involve long hours, nominees should have the stamina to participate fully. The nominating agency must assure that the nominee is aware of the time commitments required for service on the BOE. The nominee should assure that his/her employer is willing to grant the appropriate time (e.g., release, contractual, professional) to accept BOE assignments.

BOE members are initially appointed to three-year terms. They undergo intensive training in the application of NCATE standards and in the conduct of an accreditation review. The performance of team members and the chair is evaluated by the institution and by other team members following each on-site review. In addition, the UAB evaluates the quality of BOE team reports. This information is included in the record of each member of the BOE. At the expiration of a member's term, NCATE reviews the performance evaluations and makes a recommendation to the constituent organization for either reappointing the member to another three-year term or replacing the member. Members may be reappointed for a second three-year term and reappointed for additional terms after participation in another training session.

Becoming a Member of the BOE

BOE members must be nominated by one of NCATE's constituent members (e.g., AACTE, NEA, AFT, CCSO, NAEYC, CEC, or NCTM). To determine whether you belong to one or more of NCATE's constituent members, visit "About NCATE" on NCATE's website. Contact the association directly for information on becoming nominated to the BOE. Many have application forms that must be completed for consideration. Potential BOE members should not send letters of recommendation or résumés directly to the NCATE office; all nominations must be submitted by a constituent member organization.

Following nomination by a constituent member, a BOE nominee is invited by NCATE to a training session, which is normally held in either late July or early November. The training is primarily small-group work that simulates the work of BOE teams, but it does include some large-group lectures. Trainees are expected to prepare for the training by completing NCATE's on-line modules that introduce NCATE's standards and procedures. They must also attend the training session, which includes a simulation of an on-site visit. NCATE covers all costs of training.

Trainees are evaluated at the end of training by their peers and by trainers who are experienced BOE members. If it is determined, upon review of peer or trainer evaluations, that an individual is unsuitable for BOE work, NCATE contacts the constituent organization and notifies the individual. In these cases, NCATE will train a replacement from the constituent group at the next training session. Following each on-site visit, the performance of BOE members is evaluated by institutions and other national and state BOE members and state consultants who served on the same visiting team. The

UAB's BOE Committee reviews data at its semi-annual meetings about the overall performance of BOE members. These data help determine (1) if changes need to be made in training and (2) whether a member should be removed from the BOE.

Most BOE members begin developing their knowledge and skills during their first BOE training, but they become competent as they participate with experienced members during their first visits. BOE members are expected to: work effectively as a team, use multiple evaluation tools effectively, review exhibits electronically, have in-depth knowledge of the NCATE standards, conduct on-site visits appropriately, and be professional in all aspects of their NCATE work.

BOE members who are recommended as potential team chairs by their peers and institutions are invited to chair visiting teams. They have a record of high performance, leadership skills, and interest in being a chair. New team chairs participate in a one-day chair retreat with experienced chairs before they chair their first visit. Successful BOE team chairs: have a thorough understanding of the NCATE process and standards; make the on-site visit a learning experience for less experienced team members; conscientiously follow NCATE guidelines and timelines; ask questions when uncertain and keep in touch with NCATE when problems arise; are quietly authoritative—exercise leadership without being overbearing or inflexible and are willing to hear all sides yet able to keep discussions focused; and are organized, good managers, and able to coordinate activities.

BOE members who consistently turn down assignments or drop off teams once an assignment has been accepted may be dropped from the Board. Continued assignment is predicated upon satisfactory performance.

14. What kind of training do you provide for reviewers? How do you address issues related to the professional competence of reviewers should these arise?

All nominees must successfully complete an intensive week-long training session to be eligible to serve on BOE teams. Training sessions are held twice a year.

After NCATE receives BOE nominations from its member organizations, NCATE sends the nominees a letter notifying them of the two training sessions and asking them to indicate the session they can attend. Details about the training session and materials that should be read before training are sent to nominees several months before the training session. BOE nominees are also asked to work through the Online BOE Training Modules prior to training.

The training is a combination of large and small group work that simulates the work of BOE teams. Trainees must attend the entire training and are expected to attend and participate in all sessions. NCATE covers all costs of training. The following is an outline of the training schedule:

Sunday

Welcome and Introduction of Participants
Introduction to NCATE by NCATE President, Arthur Wise
Dinner/Community Building

Monday

NCATE: Performance-based Accreditation
The Role of the BOE
Preparing for an NCATE On-site Visit
Conceptual Framework
NCATE Unit Standards Pre-test
Standard 1 -Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions and Standard 2 – Assessment Systems and Unit Evaluations
Judging the Quality of Evidence
Standard 3 - Field and Clinical Experiences and Standard 4 -Diversity
Using the Planning Instrument

Tuesday

BOE Recommendations: New Accreditation Decisions

Standard 5 – Faculty Qualifications, Performance and Development and Resources and;

Standard 6 – Unit Governance and Resources

Conducting Interviews

Code of Conduct

Writing the BOE Report

Reviewing Not Met Standards

Introduction to the Simulation

Simulation of 1st Team meeting (Using the planning instrument)

Wednesday

On-site Simulation at a College or University

Meeting with team/writing

Thursday

Simulation of Wednesday Morning Team meeting

Review of the Process

Friday

Feedback on Writing BOE Reports

Dialogue with BOE and UAB Members

Review of BOE Role/Code of Conduct

Trainees are evaluated at the end of training by their peers and cadre leaders who are experienced BOE members. If it is determined, upon review of peer or trainer evaluations, that an individual is unsuitable for BOE work, NCATE will notify the individual and contact the constituent organization that nominated them. In these cases, NCATE will train a replacement from the constituent group at the next training.

- 15. How do you work 'outside the box' with programs that are doing research on teacher education, building scholarship around their programs and contributing to the knowledge base on learning to teach? Currently California has the option of an institution offering an Experimental Programs and the program may be excused from some requirements.**

NCATE currently has three state partnership options, although, states have taken advantage of only two. The options in use require NCATE Unit Review and either national or state program review. In response to state interest, NCATE adopted a third option known as "Performance-Based Standards Framework." This framework requires that the state have a comprehensive licensing assessment system that yields data on candidate content knowledge, professional and pedagogical knowledge, professional dispositions, and impact on student learning. These outcomes must be aligned with relevant professional and state teaching standards. This option would substitute aggregated data for national or state program review. Institutions in states with such systems would be reviewed according to NCATE's Unit Standards and an analysis of licensing results field-by-field. It has been brought to NCATE's attention that certain institutions operating "Experimental Programs" have developed and are using an assessment system known as the "Performance Assessment for California." It is possible that this system may be determined to meet the requirements contemplated by NCATE's third partnership option.

- 16. What is the financial and management strength of NCATE?**

NCATE:

- employs 34 full-time and 3 part-time staff members;
- has 676 trained program reviewers (content-area) and 572 trained BOE members (site-visitors);
- has an annual budget of FY07 \$4,470,763 derived from constituent member organizations (33%), institutional fees (56%) and non-dues revenue (11%);

- completed 159 accreditation visits FY 2005-2006;
- added over 200 institutions since January, 1998; and,
- has operated for 52 years [since 1954].

California Educator Programs for which NCATE has Standards

YES Multiple subject teachers

Single subject teachers

YES English,

YES math

YES social studies

YES science

NO art

YES PE

YES languages other than English

NO business

NO home economics,

YES Industrial technology education

NO music (accepts NASM)

NO agriculture

YES health

YES Special Education teachers -- mild-moderate, moderate-severe, visually impaired, deaf/
hard of hearing, physical impairments

NO Clinical Rehab -- speech and language, audiology (accepts ASHA)

YES Bilingual specialists certificate

? BCLAD emphasis for MS and SS

? English learners certificate (TESOL?)

NO Agriculture specialists

NO Math specialists

YES Reading specialists

YES Early childhood specialists

YES School Psychologists

NO School Counselors (accepts CACREP)

NO School Social Workers

NO Child Welfare and Attendance

YES School Administrators

NO School nurses

YES Library media teachers

NO Designated subjects: vocational education and adult education

NCATE Program Reviews Require Assessments of Candidates' Impact on Student Learning

NCATE Professional Standards

Standard I: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Student Learning for Teacher Candidates:

Teacher candidates focus on student learning as shown in their assessment of student learning, use of assessments in instruction, and development of meaningful learning experiences for students based on their developmental levels and prior experience.

The following are the assessments required by the program standards for each specialty area that focus on student learning.

Early Childhood Education (National Association for the Education of Young Children - NAEYC)

#5 (Required)-EFFECTS ON STUDENT LEARNING: Assessment that demonstrates candidate effects on student learning.

Educational Communications and Technology (Association for Educational Communications and Technology - AECT)

#5 (Required)-EFFECTS ON STUDENT/CLIENT LEARNING: Assessment that demonstrates candidate effects on the provision of supportive learning environments for student or client learning.

Elementary Education (Association for Childhood Education International - ACEI)

#5 (Required) – EFFECTS ON STUDENT LEARNING: Assessment that demonstrates candidate effects on student learning.

English as a Second Language (ESL) (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages - TESOL)

#5 (Required)-EFFECTS ON STUDENT LEARNING: Assessment that demonstrates candidate effects on student learning.

English Language Arts Education (National Council of Teachers of English - NCTE)

#5 (Required)-EFFECTS ON STUDENT LEARNING: Assessment that demonstrates candidate effects on student learning.

Foreign Languages Education (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages - ACTFL)

#5 (Required)-EFFECTS ON STUDENT LEARNING: Assessment that demonstrates candidate effects on student learning.

Health Education (American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance - AAHPERD/American Association for Health Education -AAHE)

#5 (Required) EFFECTS ON STUDENT LEARNING: Assessment that demonstrates candidate effects on student learning.

Mathematics Education (National Council of Teachers of Mathematics - NCTM)

#5 (Required)-EFFECTS ON STUDENT LEARNING: Assessment that demonstrates candidate effects on student learning.

Middle Schools Education (National Middle Schools Association – NMSA)

#5 (Required)-EFFECTS ON STUDENT LEARNING: Assessment that demonstrates candidate effects on student learning.

Health Education (American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance - AAHPERD/National Association for Sport and Physical Education – NASPE)

#5 (Required)-EFFECTS ON STUDENT LEARNING: Assessment that demonstrates candidate effects on student learning and the creation of supportive learning environments for student learning.

Reading Education (International Reading Association - IRA)

#5 (Required)-EFFECTS ON STUDENT LEARNING: Assessment that demonstrates and evaluates candidate effects on student learning and provision of supportive learning environments for student learning.

Science Education (National Science Teachers Association – NSTA)

#5 (Required) EFFECTS ON STUDENT LEARNING: An assessment that demonstrates candidate effects on student learning of science.

Social Studies Education (National Council for the Social Studies - NCSS)

#5 (Required)-EFFECTS ON STUDENT LEARNING: Assessment that demonstrates candidate effects on student learning.

Special Education (Council for Exceptional Children - CEC)

#5 (Required)-EFFECTS ON STUDENT LEARNING: Assessment that demonstrates candidate effects on student learning.

Technology Education (International Technology Education Association/Council on Technology Teacher Education - ITEA/CTTE)

#5 (Required)-EFFECTS ON STUDENT LEARNING: Assessment that demonstrates candidates' effects on student learning.

Educational Leadership (Educational Leadership Constituent Council - ELCC)

#5 (Required)-EFFECTS ON STUDENT LEARNING: Assessment that demonstrates candidates' ability to support student learning and development.

School Library Media Specialist - American Library Association (ALA)/ American Association of School Librarians (AASL)

#5 (Required)-EFFECTS ON STUDENT LEARNING: Assessment that demonstrates candidate effects on the creation of supportive learning environments for student learning.

School Psychology (National Association of School Psychologists - NASP)

#6 (Required)-EFFECTS ON STUDENT LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS AND/OR LEARNING: Assessment that demonstrates that candidates are able to integrate domains of knowledge and apply professional skills in delivering a comprehensive range of services evidence by measurable positive impact on children, youth, families, and other consumers.

TEAC's Responses to the Posed California Questions

1. What programs can be reviewed through your program review process (see list of current California programs below)? What would the program review process look like? When would it occur?

Nearly all programs listed below can be treated directly in the TEAC process, but some fall under TEAC's recognition policy of the accrediting work of other accrediting organizations recognized by the Council of Higher Education (CHEA) or the United States Department of Education (USDE). The latter would be school psychology, counseling, child welfare, school nurses, library media, clinical rehabilitation and TEAC would accept and recognize the accreditation they earned from a federally recognized accreditor.

For the programs TEAC would accredit directly, the program would prepare an Inquiry Brief in which it would document the evidence it has for its claims that its graduates are competent, caring, and qualified professionals and that the evidence satisfies a scholarly standard of reliability and validity. In addition there are a number of requirements with regard to the program's capacity to monitor and sustain quality.

With regard to the programs that are treated indirectly, TEAC examines the self-study report prepared for the other accreditor with regard to the evidence of competence, the formal notification of accreditation, and any rejoinders that took place. We currently have this arrangement in New York and New Jersey.

2. How would your accreditation process address California specific issues—adopted K-12 student content standards, teaching English learners, and addressing diversity—in both the program and institution reviews?

Technically, TEAC does not accredit an institution but only programs within institutions. For the purposes of TEAC accreditation, however, institutions may treat what seem like separate programs as one program provided the separate programs share a logic and common philosophy, share a common quality control system and the evidence of student learning is comparable when disaggregated.

TEAC requires that the claims the program makes with regard to the fact that its graduates understand the subject matter they will teach, the relevant pedagogical knowledge in the field, and the teaching skills of the graduates is consistent with the claims they make elsewhere, including the claims they must make to California that they satisfy California's content standards for teacher preparation.

In other states many programs have simply claimed that they meet their state's standards (e.g., INTASC) and show how these standards are consistent with TEAC's principles and requirements (which they are).

With regard to diversity (as well as technology and independent learning) the programs must show that the graduates are prepared to teach all the students they are likely to find in the modern classroom.

3. Would you be willing to use California specific teacher preparation program standards rather than your own national standards? Do you do this in any other state currently? How would this work?

It is almost certain that the California curriculum standards for teacher preparation align with TEAC's quality principles and standards. The standards of other states, the national associations, even NCATE's, align with TEAC's principles, standards, and requirements. Programs in these states simply claim to TEAC that they satisfy their state's standards and show in a few paragraphs or in a table how the state's standards align with TEAC's principles and standards. In other words, a California program cannot have claims for TEAC that differ materially from its claims it has historically made to the state. This means that TEAC accredited programs in California must address the California teacher education curriculum standards in their case for TEAC's quality principle I.

4. If California accepted national accreditation in lieu of state accreditation for those institutions that voluntarily seek national accreditation, how might that work with your system?

We have agreements with other states that accomplish precisely this outcome (e.g., Ohio, Michigan, New Jersey, and Utah). In practical terms, this means that the program's claims align with the state teacher preparation standards and that a representative of the state is a consultant member of the TEAC audit team. It also means that the state receives copies of all reports associated with the TEAC process (the self-study or Inquiry Brief, the audit report, the staff analysis of the case for accreditation, the accreditation panel report, and the accreditation committee decision). The principal benefit to the state is access to these reports, which contain information that would otherwise not be available to the state. Most states still retain the authority to make an independent program approval decision, but they use the full record of the TEAC process and rely on TEAC's determinations in their decision-making.

5. If California mandated national accreditation for all institutions, what role would the state play with respect to the accreditation decisions of California's institutions?

New York and New Jersey, for example, require accreditation of all programs in their states that lead to a professional license and rely on TEAC's accreditation determination. The state departments of education staff members participate in the audit as consultants on state policy and regulation. TEAC also requires that a local practitioner also be a member of the audit team to provide local context to help round out and inform the auditor's work.

New York has added some requirements, beyond what TEAC would normally require, and the state members of the audit team help verify the evidence for these requirements.

6. How would your process operate if there is no program approval process or reviews done by California?

The process would operate as it does in Ohio, New Jersey, Utah, and Michigan where the state relies on TEAC accreditation for program approval. Accredited programs receive program approval or are considered approved by the state. The state makes no further review.

7. Does your accreditation system examine alternative certification programs that are administered by a higher education institution or by a local K-12 agency? How does this process work?

Yes. The process works exactly as it does for a regular program with evidence for claims being documented in an Inquiry Brief. With regard to a K-12 agency, there would need to be some negotiation and modification with respect to TEAC's federally approved capacity standards which are tailored to higher education institutions, but there is nothing in principle that would not be applicable to an agency with capacity to educate and train teachers.

8. California's educator preparation enterprise encompasses 90+ institutions, ranging in size from under 25 to over 1,000 candidates per year. How is accreditation within your system paid for, and what might be the cost structure for institutions in California

TEAC institutions pay annual dues of \$2500 and an additional \$2000 in the year of the audit visit (once in five years and at ten year intervals thereafter). They pay all costs associated with the audit visit. At the moment TEAC has a flat fee structure that is independent of program size.

9. What is the link in your system between program outcomes and student achievement? Do you see a link? If so, how do you measure the relationship?

The TEAC system of accreditation is based on the evidence of student achievement or candidate achievement. If the question refers to pupil or school achievement, and not candidate achievement per se, the link has a place in TEAC's system as well. TEAC requires evidence that the graduates can teach in a caring and effective manner and one source of credible evidence of this is the whether the graduates own students have learned what was taught to them by the graduates. TEAC requires that programs declare whether they have evidence along these lines and if they do not, they are encouraged to secure it if at all possible (in some states there are confidentiality provisions that preclude securing this line of evidence). Programs typically find evidence of this kind in work samples.

10. What are the levels of accreditation that your system offers?

TEAC has the following levels of accreditation: candidacy for those that meet the eligibility requirements, preaccreditation for new programs or programs that are on track for accreditation, provisional accreditation for programs that have significant

weaknesses but are overall acceptable, initial accreditation for the program's first Inquiry Brief, and continuing accreditation thereafter.

11. When an institution is not accredited, is there an appeal process? If yes, how does the appeal process work?

Yes, the process is spelled out in TEAC's Operation's Policy Manual. An appeals process is also required of all federally recognized accreditors. An appeals panel of Board members hears the appeal and makes a decision.

Throughout the TEAC process there is opportunity for program response. In fact, the program is entitled to have an observer at the accreditation panel meeting to watch the proceedings, discussion, and voting. The TEAC process is transparent, has provisions for formative evaluation and coaching, and it is unlikely that TEAC will have to implement its appeals mechanisms.

12. In case of a conditional accreditation, how does your system address subsequent reviews?

TEAC requires an annual report (an internal audit) from all programs and whatever weaknesses and stipulations are associated with the accreditation decision are treated in these annual reports.

13. How does your system insure that reviewers have the expertise appropriate for the institutions programs?

TEAC auditors, panel members, and committee members are trained and many of the panel members are recognized experts in the field (some are practitioners and public members by federal requirement). One member of the panel must have experience and background with the level and type of institution that offers the program. The program has the opportunity to review the credentials of the audit team members and has the opportunity to accept or reject them.

One member of the audit team is always one of TEAC's staff auditors. These are persons whose position with TEAC is to audit programs, thus insuring a stability and uniformity in interpretation and application of the process.

Similarly, the panel and committee are the same members over established terms of three years, also insuring consistency.

14. What kind of training do you provide for reviewers? How do you address issues related to the professional competence of reviewers should these arise?

TEAC training is comprised of a series of two-three day workshops, the first being the writing workshop which Inquiry Brief authors take. Auditors receive additional training in a separate three day workshop, and panelists and committee members receive training and refresher courses before each panel or committee meeting. In addition to the

workbooks associated with these workshops, there are comprehensive manuals and guidelines for the reviewers.

15. How do you work 'outside the box' with programs that are doing research on teacher education, building scholarship around their programs and contributing to the knowledge base on learning to teach? Currently California has the option of an institution offering an Experimental Programs and the program may be excused from some requirements.

TEAC's Quality Principle III requires program faculty members to provide evidence that they make inquiries into the features of their program that impact student learning. Program's "working outside the box," as you put it, find the TEAC system accommodating and many of our programs report that this principle of TEAC is what attracted them to TEAC in the first place.

In fact TEAC has presented at AACTE and AERA the contributions to the knowledge base that have come from the first cycles of its accreditation activities. TEAC's members have also presented panels at regional and national meetings about what they have learned about their own programs from preparing Inquiry Briefs, which after all are research monographs in their own right. The TEAC staff also regularly contributes to the scholarly literature based on the findings in the accreditation process.

Types of Educator Programs offered in California most include Internship options

- **Multiple subject teachers**
- **Single subject teachers—English, math, social studies, science, art, PE, languages other than English, business, home economics, industrial technology education, music, agriculture, and health.**
- **Special Education teachers—mild-moderate, moderate-severe, visually impaired, deaf and hard of hearing, physical impairments**
- **Clinical Rehab—speech and language, audiology,**
- **Bilingual specialists certificate**
- **BCLAD emphasis for MS and SS**
- **English learners certificate**
- **Agriculture specialists**
- **Math specialists**
- **Reading specialists**
- **Early childhood specialists**
- **School Psychologists**
- **School Counselors**
- **School Social Workers**
- **Child Welfare and Attendance**
- **School Administrators**
- **School nurses**
- **Library media teachers**
- **Designated subjects: vocational education and adult education**

